

1 telephone calls directed to? Was there anybody that could
2 look you in the eye and say that, yes, we have the licenses
3 or, no, we don't have the licenses?

4 But it seems to me if somebody can't tell you
5 that, yes, we have the licenses, that I don't know where
6 this drawer is going to materialize from. I mean, that's a
7 very -- it seems to me anyway it's a very narrow, specific,
8 objective question.

9 THE WITNESS: Well, the way the -- this
10 information was conveyed to me was that they had looked
11 through Behrooz's files and his drawers because he's very
12 disorganized evidently -- this came out -- in the way he
13 files things.

14 JUDGE SIPPEL: Now, who is telling you this? Mr.
15 Price?

16 THE WITNESS: Whoever was in this two or three day
17 period after there might be a problem. That one of the
18 problems is that Behrooz's records -- who he's the one
19 that's keeping all this -- there's a problem. In fact, the
20 earlier document discovery we had today, Your Honor, is a
21 symptom of the fact that this fellow does not organize his
22 things in a normal business-like way.

23 And so I had a lot of difficulty believing we
24 could do something like this wrong. I just couldn't believe
25 it because we hired the people; we had flocks of lawyers; we

1 had every system in place to get it right. I just kept
2 thinking, well, you know, maybe they're just going to find
3 out they were wrong and we did do it right. The whole
4 business was organized to do it right.

5 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, all they'd need to find is
6 something in a drawer that was really Appendix A to the
7 complaint.

8 THE WITNESS: Right.

9 JUDGE SIPPEL: I mean that's all it is. All you
10 had to do was just type into a computer as the information
11 came in what it was. And you'd hit a button and you could
12 have a weekly report right across the board. Nobody's
13 interested in that.

14 THE WITNESS: That was not evidently followed as
15 it should have been. It should have been followed. It
16 wasn't.

17 JUDGE SIPPEL: I mean, what I'm suggesting is not
18 a complicated, time-consuming, overwhelming kind of thing at
19 all. I mean, this is a very straight-forward -- this
20 Appendix A is as straight-forward as you can get. All you
21 have to do is just do it once a week or twice a month or
22 something.

23 THE WITNESS: I agree with you a hundred percent.
24 That's one of the reasons why perhaps Peter assumed Behrooz
25 was doing it. I certainly assumed Peter was doing it.

1 Maybe the fact that it is so easy to do was the reason why
2 everybody assumed it was being done, but in fact the one
3 person who certainly was involved in doing it was confused
4 about how it should be done. So it didn't get done. I
5 really don't know the answer to it. Peter should have
6 reviewed this regularly. No question about it.

7 JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Well, I -- I don't --
8 I'm not trying to sit here and embarrass you or your company
9 or anybody else. But, you know, this -- this exhaustive
10 report that you talked about, it never -- I haven't had that
11 brought to my attention, so I don't know. I -- I have to go
12 through this probably the second, third or fourth time for
13 you. But it -- as long as we're getting all the documents
14 out, you've gotten his testimony with respect to the
15 conflict in dates. I'm not sure what else we're going to
16 get from this Witness.

17 MR. HOLT: I just have a couple of more things,
18 Your Honor, if I may. If you'll just indulge me for a
19 minute, I just want to make sure that I have everything.

20 JUDGE SIPPEL: Sure. Let's go off the record a
21 minute.

22 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

23 JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Back on record.

24 Thanks, Mr. Holt.

25 BY MR. HOLT:

1 Q Mr. Milstein, I just want to focus again on the
2 possible transaction involving the sale of some or all of
3 Liberty to -- what was the name of the company that you were
4 --

5 A Videotron.

6 Q Videotron. Am I correct to assume that it was --
7 as part of that transaction or proposed transaction, it
8 would have been your desire to maximize the value of
9 whatever sale may have been occasioned during the
10 transaction? Do you follow me?

11 A Yes. It's always my objective to maximize the
12 value of what we own.

13 Q And it would have been your objective to maximize
14 the value to you of the moneys received from Videotron as
15 part of the transaction, correct?

16 A Yes. But as I indicated to Mr. Beckner, that
17 might be done by waiting to install subscribers as opposed
18 to rushing to install subscribers.

19 Q Are you saying that under the transaction that you
20 were contemplating, that you would have been paid more to
21 install subscribers after the transaction had been
22 consummated than you would have been paid on a per-
23 subscriber basis before the transaction was consummated?

24 A That's possible, yes.

25 Q Is that the way the transaction was actually --

1 A I don't recall.

2 Q -- being structured?

3 A No, I don't recall.

4 Q You have no recollection?

5 A No, I don't. In other words, as I --

6 Q So --

7 A -- as I answered Mr. Beckner, what a purchaser was
8 investing in in Liberty Cable is a platform from which to
9 expand the business.

10 Q But that investor's expectations would have been
11 tied somewhat to the number of subscribers that were tied to
12 that platform, correct?

13 A Not give or take 500 or a thousand which is the
14 kind of a number which you could -- could do quickly as
15 opposed to in the normal course of business. It's not
16 sensitive to that kind of a number. Whereas it would be
17 sensitive to what the progress is after the purchase. There
18 may be certain minimum requirements to hook up subscribers
19 after the investment. So you can't say without looking at
20 what the final deal would have been. And there was no final
21 deal ever done. You can't say with certainty which way it
22 would have cut.

23 Q What number of subscribers in your mind would have
24 created some sensitivity --

25 A I mean, it's all hypothetical. I don't think that

1 that's the --

2 JUDGE SIPPEL: This is -- all this testimony --
3 the questions are hypothetical.

4 THE WITNESS: Yes.

5 JUDGE SIPPEL: I mean, he's -- I've been very
6 lenient with Mr. Beckner's line on this. And I think this
7 is getting repetitious and we're not getting anywhere with
8 it.

9 BY MR. HOLT:

10 Q Mr. Milstein, you've indicated that it was the
11 company's objective always to enhance the customer base, to
12 sign on as many new customers as possible, correct?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And as quickly as possible, right?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And was that message conveyed to others within the
17 Liberty organization?

18 A Yes.

19 Q To Mr. Price?

20 A Well, it didn't have to be conveyed per se. I
21 mean, this is the way you run a business. It's -- you don't
22 -- it's not something that you put as the motto over your
23 door or something. I mean, that's obvious in business.
24 That's what you want to do. That's what you're in business
25 for.

1 Q So Mr. Price understood that it was Liberty's
2 objective to sign up as many customers as quickly as
3 possible?

4 A Yes, but he also understood that he has to do it
5 within the regulatory requirements. Otherwise he's not
6 accomplishing anything.

7 Q Well, is it Mr. Ontiveros' understanding, as well,
8 that it was the company's objective to sign on as many
9 customers as possible?

10 JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, I'll sustain the objection.
11 Let's go. Something else, please.

12 BY MR. HOLT:

13 Q Earlier you testified that there were a number of
14 ways in which Pepper & Corazzini could have compared
15 documents that were maintained internally by Liberty to have
16 ascertained that Liberty was operating unauthorized OFS
17 paths, correct?

18 A There as something -- I said something to that
19 effect, yes.

20 Q And you indicated one way was to compare the copy
21 of the Lehmkuhl memorandum of February 24th, the license
22 inventory, with the installation report that was generated
23 on a weekly basis, correct?

24 A Well, you're jumping way ahead. I've only seen
25 these documents for the first time as part of this -- these

1 hearings. And so I am speculating that it seems to me the
2 little that I know about it looking at it on the first time
3 that it could have been done that way or a number of other
4 ways.

5 Q And my question is what other ways could it have
6 been --

7 A Oh, I don't know. That's for them to figure out.
8 If I -- if I studied all this material, I'd figure out ways
9 to do it. If I was given the responsibility of auditing it,
10 I'd have to figure it out or I'd write back to my client I
11 can't do it; can't get the responsibility and not do it
12 which is what they did.

13 Q I had thought that perhaps you had some other ways
14 in mind.

15 A No, I have no particular ways.

16 MR. HOLT: That's all I have, Your Honor. Thank
17 you.

18 JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Weber?

19 MR. WEBER: Thank you.

20 BY MR. WEBER:

21 Q Mr. Milstein, you'll recall I'm Joseph Weber with
22 the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau.

23 A Good morning.

24 Q I would like you to again look at TW/CV Exhibit
25 Number 34 --

1 A Yes.

2 Q -- which is the final one. I do recall you did
3 say you don't recall seeing this document before. I'd just
4 like you to thumb through it quickly and tell me if it is
5 the type of document that if your brother, Edward, had seen,
6 if he would have shared it with you.

7 A My brother, Edward, is not a great reader of
8 documents whereas -- we average out to about an average
9 education. My brother, Edward, did not graduate from high
10 school. And so, you know, he doesn't read things. And
11 that's of course one of the reasons why he would not be
12 involved in a legal proceeding or in a technical kind of
13 thing like this to any degree.

14 I mean, he might ask a question if he heard what
15 was going on. But he would not -- this is not the kind of
16 thing that he would receive. This is not his -- his type of
17 thing. If he had received it and someone said this is
18 important -- if someone wrote this is important, Eddie, you
19 know, look at it, he would have immediately discussed it
20 with me. This is not the kind of thing that he would try to
21 handle himself.

22 MR. WEBER: With the documents we were given this
23 morning from Liberty, we do have a -- we do have a version
24 of this exhibit, Exhibit 34, which has handwriting on it
25 which has Mr. Edward Milstein's initials. Your Honor, may I

1 show this to the Witness and see if he can recognize this as
2 his brother's handwriting?

3 JUDGE SIPPEL: Is there any objection?

4 MR. SPITZER: No objection. Can you just indicate
5 a Bates number so that we can --

6 MR. WEBER: Oh, it's Bates number 17324 through
7 327.

8 BY MR. WEBER:

9 Q Is that your brother's handwriting?

10 A No, this is -- this says, "ELM/2", and then it
11 says, "FYI B" something. Now, I infer from this that
12 Behrooz sent this to Eddie.

13 Q Okay.

14 JUDGE SIPPEL: Who is Eddie?

15 THE WITNESS: Eddie's my brother.

16 JUDGE SIPPEL: All right.

17 BY MR. WEBER:

18 Q We can ask Mr. Nourain --

19 A Right.

20 Q -- when he is in next. So --

21 A Right. Probably -- I mean I don't know what Eddie
22 did with this. Are you asking anything further about it?

23 Q Well, no. I mean, you do not recall your brother
24 sharing --

25 A No.

1 Q -- this document with you?

2 A No.

3 Q At this -- in early 1995, how familiar with which
4 buildings were operating at that time?

5 A I think I had a pretty good handle on the
6 addresses of the buildings that we were operating because we
7 were proud of, you know, every building we hooked up. And,
8 you know, we ran those little ads on the front page of the
9 New York Times that says another building has been
10 liberated, et cetera. So I think I knew most of the
11 addresses.

12 Q So on -- say, on April 28th, 1995, if somebody
13 asked you is -- are the people at 220 East Fifty-second
14 Street receiving service, do you know if you would have been
15 able to answer them?

16 A That's not a building that rings a bell per se.
17 But for most buildings without saying specifically, I would
18 have been able to recognize the -- the addresses of most
19 buildings certainly that we had signed contracts with. The
20 exact date of when we would initiate service would be a
21 little more vague in my mind. So I would -- I would -- the
22 thing I would know is the signed contracts for sure.

23 Q And do you know if your brother had the same
24 familiarity as you had?

25 A Approximately the same.

1 Q When you learned there were buildings that went
2 into operation without licenses, did you personally have any
3 discussions with anybody at Pepper & Corazzini about that
4 fact?

5 A I don't believe so, no.

6 Q Do you know if Mr. Price did?

7 A I believe he did, yes.

8 Q Do you know who he spoke to?

9 A No, I don't.

10 Q What were the consequences to Mr. Price, if any,
11 for allowing facilities to go into operation without
12 licenses?

13 A Well, I said I reviewed my deposition. And I
14 guess it's a pretty accurate characterization of what
15 occurred. About three or four months after this discovery,
16 my brother said to me are you finished torturing Peter yet
17 because I would constantly make remarks to him about --
18 basically balling him out for having fouled this up. He
19 didn't get a bonus -- this is also in my deposition -- for a
20 number of years thereafter.

21 And, you know, we did -- we did consider firing
22 everybody that was involved in this and ultimately concluded
23 it really wouldn't be fair for a variety of reasons,
24 different reasons in each case, to fire people because of
25 this. But that was a -- something that was considered

1 between my brother and myself and Lloyd Constantine. So the
2 people involved got very close to being fired which was
3 communicated to them.

4 They were -- Behrooz was effectively then demoted.
5 Peter was severely reprimanded to within an inch of his life
6 at the time. I said tougher things to Peter, I think, than
7 I've ever said to anybody in my business career when it
8 occurred. And the truth of it is and the reality is that he
9 did more to jeopardize the company than our arch competitor,
10 Time Warner, had ever been able to do.

11 He single-handedly had inflicted more damage on
12 the company by not following through and doing the obvious
13 things that should have been done and that were within his
14 purview. And he has to live with that. And, of course, I
15 have to live with the fact that I over-estimated him.

16 Q Were -- were there any consequences to the Pepper
17 & Corazzini firm?

18 A Well, we've informed them as -- as I also said in
19 my deposition, that they should consult with their errors
20 and omissions policy. If and when this comes to a
21 resolution and we know what penalty is involved, it may be
22 appropriate that they bear some of that cost. And we'll
23 have to look at the facts at that time when they're all in
24 and see if that's appropriate. That's something I will
25 consult with counsel on.

1 MR. WEBER: Thank you. Nothing further.

2 JUDGE SIPPEL: I just want to just ask you, I --
3 this was talked about, but you hadn't really looked at it
4 and identified it. This is Exhibit 2 -- your Exhibit 2.
5 And I'll show you, this is a copy of it. In fact, that's
6 the exhibits that's been received into evidence. Is that
7 the mandate that you were referring to?

8 THE WITNESS: I don't know, Your Honor. What I'm
9 referring to --

10 JUDGE SIPPEL: Counsel identified it as --

11 THE WITNESS: Well, he may think it is. The thing
12 that I'm referring to is a general understanding that I
13 gained from the results of the investigation that Lloyd
14 Constantine and his firm conducted and reported to me both
15 orally and which I read. So I have a general impression
16 from that report, both in its oral and written form, that's
17 the basis for my account. This memo, per se, is not the
18 basis of my comment. And I may be --

19 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, what I heard you to say, and
20 I think the transcript will bear me out on this, is you said
21 that you said that Pepper & Corazzini, the regulating
22 attorneys had gotten a mandate.

23 THE WITNESS: Yes.

24 JUDGE SIPPEL: And that mandate you assumed was
25 being carried out until you had heard something to the

1 contrary. And I asked you about where that mandate was, and
2 you said that it was a piece of paper. And, anyway, one
3 question led to the other and this is what it came down to.

4 THE WITNESS: Okay. If I said anything that led
5 you to believe that I was aware of the mandate before I was
6 aware of the problem, that's not accurate. It's only --

7 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I haven't even asked that
8 question yet.

9 THE WITNESS: Okay. It's only after the --

10 JUDGE SIPPEL: I just wanted to know is this the
11 mandate that you're referring to.

12 THE WITNESS: This may be the mandate.

13 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, do you want to take a look at
14 it?

15 THE WITNESS: Yes.

16 JUDGE SIPPEL: It's not very long.

17 THE WITNESS: This would not be -- this would not
18 be the memo that would do that. My understanding is that a
19 memo exists to -- that -- that instructs Pepper & Corazzini
20 to audit from time-to-time all our licenses and make sure
21 that they are -- we have licenses for everything that's --
22 that we have proper licenses that are in effect.

23 My understanding was that it had to do with making
24 sure not so much that we had the licenses as making sure all
25 these STAs are good for a certain period of time. And my

1 impression was that whether it's nine -- three months or six
2 months, that part of the task was to make sure that they got
3 renewed timely.

4 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that's STAs.

5 THE WITNESS: Right.

6 JUDGE SIPPEL: But there are also licenses, too.

7 THE WITNESS: Right.

8 JUDGE SIPPEL: I mean, you're really -- you were
9 covered on both fronts, right, or --

10 THE WITNESS: Right. In my mind as I name this
11 information which, as I say, is not from reading the source
12 materials but from reading the summary conclusions and
13 having the investigation discussed with me, my impression
14 was that the licensing attorneys had been asked to audit
15 this process. And my own internal inference was not so much
16 to make sure we did it right the first time, but over time
17 to make sure we did it right.

18 JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. So then this -- but
19 this information was coming to you after the fact. This is
20 how I'm hearing it today.

21 THE WITNESS: Yes. I was aware -- I wasn't aware
22 of any of this -- of what systems were in place before.

23 JUDGE SIPPEL: That's my exact -- you're
24 anticipating my question here. But Liberty Exhibit 2 right
25 in front of you, that was -- you didn't see that document

1 until after the investigation began or after --

2 THE WITNESS: That's correct. That's correct.

3 JUDGE SIPPEL: I mean, you're not copied on there.
4 You're not CCed.

5 THE WITNESS: Right.

6 JUDGE SIPPEL: So I can't assume that you were.
7 But you didn't -- you didn't see that.

8 THE WITNESS: No, I didn't.

9 JUDGE SIPPEL: And what about this other
10 memorandum that -- to set this auditing understanding up.
11 Had you seen that at any time before this investigation
12 inquiry began --

13 THE WITNESS: No, I hadn't.

14 JUDGE SIPPEL: -- in April?

15 THE WITNESS: No, I hadn't.

16 JUDGE SIPPEL: No. And you were not -- you had
17 either asked to see anything like that nor was anything
18 voluntarily given to you like that.

19 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

20 JUDGE SIPPEL: Anybody else have anything more on
21 that? Have we seen that document?

22 MR. HOLT: I don't believe I had. I was
23 wondering, maybe counsel could clarify or --

24 MR. SPITZER: Your Honor, I prefer to do so when
25 the Witness is not here just because I thought it would be

1 something to do. I'm happy to do it in his presence. He
2 may remain anyway. We are happy to represent that there is
3 no such other document and that in fact, again, I don't wish
4 to testify, but I think you will hear from Mr. Price that
5 his understanding for the foundation for Pepper & Corazzini,
6 his command to do the audit was manifested by this
7 memorandum and conversations that he had. And there is no
8 such other document which detailed in greater specificity an
9 obligation to do so.

10 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, then how did -- accepting
11 your counsel's representation at face value, how did it come
12 to your mind that there was another document beyond this?

13 THE WITNESS: Well, this doesn't quite go as far
14 as my understanding of -- it may be Mr. Price's position
15 that based on discussions in addition to this -- what
16 appears here in writing --

17 JUDGE SIPPEL: You're hypothesizing. You really
18 don't know.

19 THE WITNESS: No, I really don't know.

20 JUDGE SIPPEL: You don't know. Okay. He doesn't
21 know. Okay. That's good. Let's -- anything -- any other
22 questions? This is it. All right. Mr. Milstein, you're
23 excused as a Witness. But under my sequestration rule,
24 you're not to talk about the testimony to any of the other
25 witnesses who are going to be coming in this week. We'll

1 review this at the end of the week and see, you know, how
2 long before -- but for the present time.

3 MR. BEGLEITER: Let me make a note. We're
4 agreeing to Your Honor's position. Although I believe under
5 Rule 415, as a party designee, he would have a right to be
6 here. But we're not going -- we're not going to assert that
7 right.

8 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, if -- yes, if you were going
9 to assert that right, I would have allowed you to do that.
10 But he wouldn't -- he wouldn't be testifying up front. He'd
11 be testifying --

12 MR. BEGLEITER: Well, I'm not --

13 JUDGE SIPPEL: -- he is testifying up front so he
14 can stay here if he wants. But he can't talk to the other
15 witnesses.

16 MR. BEGLEITER: Okay. But we're going to honor
17 that, Your Honor, so there's no problem.

18 JUDGE SIPPEL: I understand. You almost caught me
19 on that one. All right. Then it's -- let's go off the
20 record for just one moment.

21 (A discussion was held off the record.)

22 JUDGE SIPPEL: This Witness is excused. We're in
23 recess until 1:45.

24 (Whereupon, the hearing recessed at 12:37 p.m. to
25 reconvene at 1:45 p.m., this same day.)

1

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

20

22

23

25

1 A It's 215 East Ninety-fifth Street in New York
2 City, New York.

3 Q For who are you currently employed?

4 A RCN.

5 Q And when -- when did you begin your employment
6 with RCN?

7 A March of 1996.

8 Q For whom were you employed before March of 1996?

9 A Liberty Cable.

10 Q And were you working for Liberty Cable in 1994 and
11 1995?

12 A Yes, sir.

13 Q And what was your -- in what capacity were you
14 working for Liberty Cable?

15 A I was directing of engineering.

16 Q And have you come to learn that in 1994 and 1995,
17 Liberty provided microwave service to buildings -- to
18 buildings without authorization?

19 A Yes.

20 Q Okay. When did you learn this?

21 A The latter part of -- the latter part of April
22 1995.

23 Q Okay. And before the latter part of April 1995,
24 did you have any idea that such unauthorized transmissions
25 were going on?

1 A No, I did not.

2 Q Mr. Nourain, can you tell us what your education
3 is, please?

4 A I finished my high school degrees in Tehran, Iran.
5 And I moved to the United States in 1970. And I finished my
6 bachelor's degree in electrical engineering at Michigan Tech
7 University, 1974, and master's degree in electrical
8 engineering at Michigan Tech in 1975.

9 Q Did you stay in the United States after you
10 graduated from Michigan Tech?

11 A I was in the United States for four months. And
12 then I moved back to Iran to work for National Iranian Oil
13 Company on August of 1976.

14 Q And obviously, there was a time that you returned
15 to the United States.

16 A That's correct.

17 Q Okay. And what year was that?

18 A 1983.

19 Q Okay. And from 1983 until you began with Liberty
20 Cable, were you employed as an engineer?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And can you tell us who employed you as an
23 engineer?

24 A I started with Western Union Telegraph Company in
25 1983 until 1985. And after that, the beginning of 1986, I

1 was with a company called Local Area Telecom until 1990.
2 Briefly in 1991 for eight months, I was working at a company
3 called Micronet. And on April of -- March -- April of 1992,
4 I started with Liberty Cable.

5 Q Okay. In those three jobs that you had prior to
6 beginning with Liberty -- Micronet, Western Union and Local
7 Area Telecom -- did any of those -- in any of those jobs,
8 did you participate in the licensing process?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Can you tell us which ones, please?

11 A On Local Area Telecommunications, I was working on
12 a technical information and working on a system which was an
13 18 gigahertz system which had the licensing.

14 Q Okay. And what did you do for Local Area Telecom
15 with regard to licensing?

16 A I provided all the technical information and
17 designed 18 gigahertz point-to-point system, part 21. And I
18 upped in all the data and I proceeded with getting the
19 frequency called Nation Study done. And at that point, it
20 was an in-house counsel which would follow up with the
21 filing and licensing part of it.

22 Q All right. After the point at which you turned
23 over your information to in-house counsel, did you have any
24 responsibility with regard to licensing at Local Area
25 Telecom?

1 A No, I did not.

2 Q Can you tell me what temporary fixed authority is?

3 A Temporary fixed authority is the expedited
4 authorization for common carriers which if you need to turn
5 on the system on an expedited basis, the counsel was telling
6 me that he could apply for it. I will get the license
7 within 24 to 48 hours.

8 Q So Local Area Telecom had what was called
9 temporary fixed authority?

10 A They had that -- they had that, yes.

11 Q Okay. Would it be fair to say, Mr. Nourain, that
12 prior to going to Liberty, your only involvement with
13 licenses were the technical aspects of licenses?

14 A That's correct.

15 Q Now, you've already testified that you began with
16 Liberty in '92. Is that correct?

17 A That's correct.

18 Q Okay. And when you were hired, were you
19 interviewed by -- by an engineer at Liberty?

20 A Yes, I did.

21 Q And what was that engineer's name?

22 A Joe Stern.

23 Q And did Mr. Stern recommend you for hiring?

24 A That's correct. After the interview.

25 Q And you were of course hired.

1 A That's correct.

2 Q When -- after you were hired, did Mr. Stern -- at
3 any time, did Mr. Stern ever sit down with you and explain
4 to you the licensing procedures that Liberty was following?

5 A No.

6 Q Now, your duties changed in 1993, didn't they?

7 A That's correct.

8 Q I'd like to tell -- if you could tell the Court,
9 please from 1993 to April of 1995 what your duties at
10 Liberty Cable were.

11 A You know, in addition to the responsibility for
12 engineering of the 18 gigahertz microwave system, at the end
13 of '93, beginning of 1994, I was also in charge of managing
14 the distribution and construction of the internal systems --
15 internal distribution system for Liberty Cable. So overall
16 my responsibility was from serving the building and also
17 doing some pre-sale support and survey of the building and
18 all the engineering aspects of it and the construction of
19 the whole project.

20 Q Now, how large was the engineering staff at
21 Liberty?

22 A Only me. Nobody else.

23 Q Okay. And what percentage of your job would you
24 say in the years 1994 and 1995 were devoted to licensing as
25 opposed to engineering?